

Reply to Office Action dated June 19, 2006

REMARKS

Claims 1-4, 10, 12-13, 15-18, 20, 23-27, 29-30 and 41-43 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 1, 4, 7-8, 10, 12, 18, 20, 23-27, 29 and 41-43 are amended and claims 6-9, 11, 19, 22-23 and 28 are canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. Various amendments are made for clarity and are unrelated to issues of patentability.

The Office Action rejects claims 1, 13, 15-22 and 41-43 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over U.S. Publication 2003-0060211 to Chern et al. (hereafter Chern) in view of U.S. Publication 2002-0080063 to Bloebaum et al. (hereafter Bloebaum) and further in view of various combinations of U.S. Publication 2003-0088637 to Hatano et al. (hereafter Hatano), newly-cited U.S. Patent 6,716,101 to Meadows et al (hereafter Meadows), U.S. Patent 6,681,109 to Leifer and/or U.S. Patent 6,603,837 to Kesanupalli. Still further, the Office Action rejects claims 23-30 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over U.S. Patent 6,660,919 to Kawase in view of Leifer and U.S. Patent 6,865,261 to Rao et al. (hereafter Rao). The rejections are respectfully traversed with respect to the pending claims.

Independent claim 1 recites transmitting the searched content to the mobile terminal, the transmitted content including conversation multimedia relevant to the particular business, the particular building or the particular public place of the current location of the mobile terminal. Independent claim 1 further recites that transmitting the searched content includes: transmitting a menu listing a plurality of situations corresponding to the determined particular business, the determined particular building or the determined

Reply to Office Action dated June 19, 2006

particular public place, displaying the menu on the mobile terminal, and transmitting, when a specific one of the situations is selected from the displayed menu on the mobile terminal, at least one conversation multimedia phrase corresponding to the selected one of the situations from the menu.

The applied references do not teach at least these features of independent claim 1. More specifically, when discussing previous dependent claim 2 (relating to the menu listing of a plurality of situations), the Office Action asserts (on page 10) that Kesanupalli teaches English language conversation. The Office Action cities Kesanupalli's col. 18, lines 35-16, and col. 19, lines 51-col. 20, line 3. However, Kesanupalli does not suggest transmitting at least one conversation multimedia phrase corresponding to a selected one of situations from a menu. That is, Kesanupalli merely relates to obtaining information regarding local restaurants, local lodgings and directions. See col. 19, lines 55-60. Kesanupalli does not relate to transmitting a menu listing a plurality of situations and transmitting at least one conversation multimedia phrase corresponding to a selected one of the situations. Kesanupalli's information regarding weather, local restaurants, lodgings and directions does not correspond to menu listings and/or conversation multimedia phrases.

The other applied references including Chern, Bloebaum, Hatano and Kawase also do not teach or suggest the missing features of independent claim 1. That is, the Office Action (on page 4) states that Hatano discloses the transmitted content including conversation multimedia relevant to the particular business, the particular building or the

Reply to Office Action dated June 19, 2006

particular public place of the mobile terminal. The Office Action cites Hatano's FIGs. 8 and 10 and paragraphs [0052]–[0055]. However, these cited sections do not relate to a menu and/or conversation multimedia phrases. Rather, Hatano merely discloses URL list data that may be constructed by a URL search assisting server 12 (FIG. 1). At best, the URL list data includes a name of a facility, pronunciation of each facility, facility contents, telephone information and location information. See FIG. 8, for example. This does not correspond to a menu listing a plurality of situations and/or transmitting at least one conversation multimedia phrase corresponding to a selected one of the situations.

Further, Kawase also does not relate to transmitting a menu listing a plurality of situations corresponding to a determined particular business, a determined particular building or a determined particular public place and transmitting at least one conversation multimedia phrase corresponding to the selected one of the situations. The Office Action (on pages 1-011) cites Kawase when discussing other claims. Kawase merely relates to a cell phone that converts languages of one country into another country. This does not correspond to transmitting a menu listing a plurality of situations, displaying the menu on the mobile phone and transmitting at least one conversation multimedia phrase corresponding to the selected one of the situations from the menu.

The applied references do not teach or suggest all the features of independent claim

1. The Office Action does not provide any reference that teaches or suggests transmitting a menu listing a plurality of situations corresponding to the determined particular business, the

Reply to Office Action dated June 19, 2006

determined particular building or the determined particular public place, and transmitting, when a specific one of the situations is selected from the displayed menu on the mobile terminal, at least one conversation multimedia phrase corresponding to the selected one of the situations from the menu. Accordingly, independent claim 1 defines patentable subject matter.

Independent claim 10 recites transmitting the multimedia data to the mobile terminal, the transmitted multimedia data including English conversation multimedia phrases relating to a plurality of conversations at a one of a business, a building or a public place corresponding to the registered final location of the tracked specific mobile terminal.

For at least similar reasons as set forth above, the applied references do not teach or suggest at least these features of independent claim 10. The Office Action (on page 6) specifically states that Chern and Bloebaum do not teach the transmitted content including conversation multimedia relevant to the particular business, the particular building or the particular public place of the mobile terminal. The Office Action then relies on Hatano's FIGs. 8 and 10 and paragraphs [0052]–[0055] for the missing features. However, the cited sections of Hatano do not teach or suggest the claimed features as they do not relate to English conversation multimedia phrases relating to a plurality of conversations at one of a business, a building or a public place corresponding to the registered final location of a tracked specific mobile terminal. More specifically, Hatano does not disclose phrases relating to a plurality of conversations. At best, Hatano only discloses a pronunciation of a facility.

Reply to Office Action dated June 19, 2006

Therefore, the applied references do not teach or suggest all the features of independent claim 10. Accordingly, independent claim 10 defines patentable subject matter at least for this reason.

Independent claim 18 recites transmitting English language conversation multimedia phrases corresponding to a plurality of conversations relevant to the specific location of the mobile terminal, and that transmitting the English language conversation multimedia phrases comprises: transmitting a menu listing the plurality of situations corresponding to the determined specific location, and transmitting, when a specific one of the situations is selected from the menu on the mobile terminal, the English language conversation multimedia phrase corresponding to the selected one of the situations from the menu.

For at least similar reasons as set forth above, the applied references do not teach or suggest at least these features of independent claim 18. The Office Action (on page 9, lines 1-2) appears to assert that Chern discloses the features relating to a location tracking procedure when the mobile terminal requests an English conversation service. However, Chern does not disclose an English conversation service. The other applied references also do not suggest this missing feature. Accordingly, independent claim 18 defines patentable subject matter.

Independent claim 23 recites a storing a plurality of English conversation multimedia phrases relating to a plurality of conversations relevant to a restaurant, and transmitting a selected one of the plurality of the restaurant related English conversation multimedia

Reply to Office Action dated June 19, 2006

phrases to the mobile terminal when it is determined that the present location of the mobile terminal is a restaurant. Independent claim 23 also recites that the restaurant related English conversation multimedia phrases are classified into a first situation multimedia data for ordering meals, a second situation multimedia data for dining at the restaurant, and a third situation multimedia data for paying a bill at the restaurant, and wherein one of the first, second, and third situation multimedia data selected from the mobile terminal is transmitted to the mobile terminal.

For at least similar reasons as forth above, the applied references do not teach or suggest at least these features of independent claim 23. As stated above, Kawase merely relates to a cell phone that converts languages. The Office Action's citation to Kawase's col. 4 relates to a dictionary conversion process. See FIG. 5. This does not correspond to phrases relating to a plurality of conversations relevant to a restaurant and/or transmitting a selected one of the phrases. Additionally, the applied references also do not teach or suggest the claimed first, second and third situation multimedia data. Rao does not teach or suggest the missing features of independent claim 23. Thus, independent claim 23 defines patentable subject matter.

For at least similar reasons as set forth above, each of independent claims 1, 10, 18 and 23 define patentable subject matter. Each of the dependent claims depends from one of the independent claims and therefore defines patentable subject matter at least for this

Reply to Office Action dated June 19, 2006

reason. In addition, the dependent claims recite features that further and independently distinguish over the applied references.

For example, dependent claim 41 recites determining the particular business, the particular building or the particular public place comprises determining that the mobile terminal is located within a restaurant, and wherein searching the database comprises searching for information corresponding to the restaurant the mobile terminal is located within. See also dependent claims 42-43. When discussing dependent claims 41-43, the Office Action states that Chern, Bloebaum and Hatano do not specifically teach a terminal located within a restaurant. The Office Action then cites Leifer as disclosing a terminal located within a restaurant. See Leifer's col. 2, lines 21-45. However, the cited section of Leifer does not relate to a determination that a mobile terminal is located within a restaurant, and searching the information corresponding to the restaurant the mobile terminal is located within. Also, there is no motivation to combine Leifer with the device of Chern, Bloembaum and Hatano as alleged in the Office Action. Rather, any motivation to combine these features is based on impermissible hindsight as there is no suggestion in the art for this modification. Dependent claims 41-43 define patentable subject matter at least for these additional reasons.

Further, dependent claim 15 recites that the multimedia data comprises English language phrases appropriate to the determined one of the business, the building or the public place. The Office Action (on pages 11-12) appears to cite Kesanupalli for these

Reply to Office Action dated June 19, 2006

features. However, Kesanupalli does not disclose English language phrases appropriate to the determined one of the business, the building or the public place. Thus, dependent claim 15 defines patentable subject matter at least for this additional reason.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration and prompt allowance of claims 1-4, 10, 12-13, 15-18, 20, 23-27, 29-30 and 41-43 are earnestly solicited. If the Examiner believes that any additional changes would place the application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this, concurrent and future replies, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 16-0607 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,
FLESHNER & KIM, LLP



David C. Oren
Registration No. 38,694

P.O. Box 221200
Chantilly, Virginia 20153-1200
(703) 766-3701 DYK:DCO/kah
Date: October 18, 2006

Please direct all correspondence to Customer Number 34610